



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

said of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, as well as of holy fathers and bishops, and of all who died in our communion. Were all these in purgatory? Surely the Church of Rome at the present day will tell "W. C. Search" that the apostles and martyrs were never in purgatory at all. Hence it is clear, that commemorations which were made for apostles and martyrs, as much as for all other faithful departed, could have nothing to do with purgatory. Does the Church of Rome include apostles and martyrs now in her purgatorial prayers? Does she not say that it would be an heretical impiety to do so? Clearly, then, these "commemorations" were not purgatorial.

"W. C. Search" thus quotes St. Chrysostom—"Not without reason was it ordained by the Apostles that, in celebrating the sacred mysteries, the dead should be remembered." "W. C. Search" points this in capital letters; and, of course, he thinks it of great force to prove purgatory. Does he not know that the Church of England and Ireland remembers or commemorates the dead in the very same way, at every celebration of the holy communion? "We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear." Why does he not quote this as a proof of purgatory? The Church of England and Ireland "remembering the dead" should surely be as good a proof of purgatory as St. Chrysostom "remembering the dead."

"W. C. Search's" quotation from St. Ephraim is not proved to be written by him. It is, in all probability, a forgery. The passages of Scripture quoted in it are enough to prove this; for he could hardly have given interpretations of Scripture so manifestly false. And even if this passage had really been written by him, it would not prove that he believed in purgatory. On the contrary, in his 12th Discourse, he affirms, "that there is no middle between hell and the kingdom of heaven."

No. 8. "W. C. Search" says, he abstains from quoting Origen. We are not surprised at this, as we have already shown that Origen's opinion on the subject is counted heretical by the Church of Rome itself.

"W. C. Search" says he also abstains from quoting Arnobius, of Sicca. We do not wonder at this either, as we know that Du Pin, the most learned man the Roman Catholic Church has had in that kind of learning, has given us this character of Arnobius, of Sicca—"It must be confessed that he did not perfectly understand the Christian religion when he wrote these books."—Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 147. Dublin, 1723.

He also abstains from quoting Basil and Ambrose. We do not wonder at this either; for we expect to be able to answer on them, too, when they are quoted.

"W. C. Search" concludes by quoting Bishop Forbes, of the Church of England; forgetting that Bishop Forbes never believed in purgatory, and that, therefore, his having used the expressions that he did, is only a further proof that such expressions may be used by those who did not believe in purgatory; and that, therefore, those expressions have a different meaning.

The great mistake that runs through all such proofs of purgatory is this, that whenever Roman Catholics read of any prayers for the dead, or any commemoration of the dead, they always take for granted that it must be for getting the souls of the dead out of purgatory, even though the writers themselves say that it is for a totally opposite purpose. We have often exposed this fallacy in the LAYMAN, and no one has yet ventured to answer upon it. Is it not a striking fact that in all the proofs, such as they are, which "W. C. Search" brings from the Fathers of the first four centuries for the doctrine of purgatory, that purgatory itself is not so much as mentioned once in any of them? Could this be so if they really believed in such a place? Is it likely that Roman Catholics now, for the space of 400 years together, should never so much as mention purgatory once in any of their writings? Yet this is what we find in the early Church. Hence it is that Roman Catholic controversialists now, in trying to prove purgatory from the first four centuries, are obliged to rely on places which make no mention of purgatory, but are forced to rest their case on "commemorations for the dead," even though such commemorations, as in the case of Constantine, were clearly intended for souls supposed to be already in heaven.

We wish Roman Catholics would look at this fairly, and at once get rid of the absurd notion, that such remembrances of the dead are any proof of purgatory.

To enable them to do this the better, we quote here a case that has recently occurred. We have, in the *Freeman's Journal* newspaper, of April 2, an account of a solemn High Mass offered on that day for the late Dr. Murray, who had died on that day month. A sermon was preached at this very High Mass by the Rev. Mr. Meagher, P.P. of Rathmines; and how did this sermon begin? It began thus—"With the holy dead all is well. St. Laurence has but embraced in heaven the last and greatest of his successors, and conducted him ere now, let us trust, to his place in the quires of everlasting jubilee; yes, with the holy dead all is well. Your city has lost a bishop, but has gained an additional patron and advocate in the skies." Now, it is clear that Mr. Meagher, when preaching this sermon at this High Mass, did not think it at all necessary to believe that the person for whom that Mass was offered was then in

purgatory. Now, if the Rev. Mr. Meagher, in preaching thus, at this High Mass, had been openly contradicting the doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the presence of all the clergy and people of Dublin, would he not have been censured? We know that his preaching was not censured but approved by all who heard him, both lay and clerical. Will any priest or authority of the Roman Catholic Church in the diocese of Dublin now pretend to say that the soul of Dr. Murray was in purgatory when that Mass was offered for him? Here, then, we have a plain and undeniable proof that the offering of sacrifice, and the making a solemn commemoration for a dead person, is no proof at all that the dead person is in purgatory. Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person, in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say that this is proof that that person was in purgatory, and that such sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of purgatory? We see plainly, in this instance, the falsehood and the fallacy of the argument. If the Church of Rome now thinks that there are other reasons for offering her sacrifice and making her commemoration now for souls that are not in purgatory, much more might the early Church offer her very different sacrifice, and make her commemoration for souls that she never believed to be in purgatory. How absurd, then, for any Roman Catholic now to say that sacrifice and commemoration for the dead cannot be for any other purpose besides getting the soul out of purgatory! Yet it is only by relying on this gross absurdity, contradicted even by their own practice at this present day, that any Roman Catholic can attempt to bring any other shadow of proof for purgatory from the early Church!

We commend this argument to the consideration of "W. C. Search;" and, until some one can answer it, we trust we shall hear no more of such proofs for purgatory from the early Church.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In reading the CATHOLIC LAYMAN of July and August last, several matters therein seriously engaged my attention, each of which I shall consider in order; and, first of all, your reply to Mr. Aylmer's question, regarding the second marriage of "her that is put away." I am sure you answer candidly, and state fairly, the law of the land and the practice of your church in these cases. But, then, another question naturally arises; the sincere inquirer after truth will be inclined to ask, how can the law of the land be at variance with the discipline or law of the church? Is it not the same power that gives efficacy to both? Is not the Sovereign of England, *pro tempore*, the supreme head of the Established Church in Great Britain and Ireland? and no act of parliament can be considered the law of the land without the royal assent and signature of such Sovereign. These, or such like questions, every person inquiring after the truths of this religion will propose to himself. You say, the "ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England refuse these divorces." Then we are to understand that "the ecclesiastical courts," &c., do not acknowledge the acts sanctioned by the spiritual head of these courts. This does not show "the whole body fitly joined and compacted," &c. (Eph. c. iv. v. 16), nor does it indicate that the church, which ought to be "one body and one spirit" (Eph. c. iv. v. 4), is careful to "keep the unity of the spirit"—Eph. c. iv. v. 3. Is it not, moreover, a fact, that in every case of a second marriage of "her that is put away," a clergyman of the Reformed Church is always found to administer the ceremony of such marriage? This appears to be a very strange feature in the Reformed Church, and one which ought to be shown as reconcilable to Gospel precept.

In page 81, July number, you ask—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of Maccabees?" That these Fathers have something to do with this book, may be seen in Clement Alexand., Stromat. Lib. 1; Cyprian, Lib. 2; Epist. 3 and 55 ad Cornel; and Origen, Lib. 6, page 290, et seq.; Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Again, with respect to purgatory, you ask—"What was the doctrine of Tertullian himself while he was a Catholic?" But in the interpretation of the passage which you quote from him, to prove what this doctrine was, I suspect you have made a serious mistake, to which I beg to call your attention. The words of Tertullian, cited by you, prove nothing, either for or against purgatory. When he says "grief for the dead is idle, and the impatience of grief is idle," he uses plain, unequivocal words, which cannot be misunderstood. He does not say that prayers for the dead are idle, or that sacrifice and alms for the dead are idle; and when you prove that "grief for the dead, &c., and the impatience of grief," &c., may be understood for prayers and sacrifice, the passage will bear your interpretation, but not till then. Tertullian does not affirm, as you state, that to pity them who are called away is to do an injury to Christ; but he says, "we do an injury to Christ when we do not contentedly accept their being called away by him, as if they were to be pitied."

Saint Nilus fully explains the nature of that grief which Tertullian deprecates, and which the Christian Church discountenances in all ages. He says—"To be grieved, to weep, to fast immoderately for the death of a relation, indicates unbelief and the want of hope. He who believes that he shall rise again from the dead will feel comfort, will return thanks to God, will change his tears into joy, will pray that he (the dead person) may obtain eternal mercy."—Lib. i., epist. 311, t. xi., p. 115.

In page 82 you reject the word "*repose*," which "W. C. S." puts into his translation of the passage he quotes from Tertullian; you blame him for using the same word again in Cyprian, "when it is, at least," you say, "a doubtful translation;" yet strange, you have not removed the doubt. "Upon falling asleep" is, at best, an obscure elucidation, and in perfect keeping with your notion of "*refrigerium*."

I request you will show from Scripture the progressive gradation of the felicity of the blest in heaven.

Cyprian's words—"non offeratur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebratur"—evidently denote actions subsequent to the time of his (*excedens*) departing this life, and can leave no doubt as to their precise meaning.

The same Cyprian is still plainer in Epist. 52, page 72, where he says—"It is one thing to be cast into prison, and not to go out till the last farthing be paid, and another to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; one in punishment of sin to be purified by long suffering and purged by long fire (or, as some have it, *diutine*), and another to have expiated all sins by previous suffering."

Concerning the doctrine of purgatory, as taught by the Catholic Church in the third century, nothing can be plainer than the words of Origen.

His words are as follow:—"For if on the foundation of Christ you have built not only gold, and silver, and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect when the soul shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to defile the kingdom of God; or, on account of these incumbrances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold, and silver, and precious stones? Neither is just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is a consuming fire. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble. It is manifest that, in the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgressions, and returns to us the reward of our good works."—Hom. 16 in Jerem., T. iii., p. 23. For more on this same subject read Hom. 6 in Exod. page 148. Hom. 14 Lev. page 259.

In page 94, August number, your distinction between *πρὸς* and *ὑπὲρ* is rather far-fetched, and will not stand the test of strict criticism; but waiving this for the present, we pass to your "*correct translation*" of the Vatican text, which, notwithstanding the importance you attach to it, proves very little, if anything, in your favour. *Περὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων*, you are found to render "*concerning the dead*," or "*on account of the dead*;" not a word about the living. There is as much said in the text about the unborn as there is about the living; and yet you say—"The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living." You adduce the case of Achan as a precedent, in which you say—"There was sacrifice offered too, for all his sheep and his oxen were burned." As *ex parte* statements prove nothing, I shall, if you permit me, place all the incidents of Achan's death before the reader. *Approved version*, Joshua vii. 24—"And Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan, the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had; and he brought them into the valley of Achor." Verse 25—"And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones."

For an holocaust consisting of victims such as those mentioned in the 24th verse above, you have neither precedent nor precept, in the law of Moses. Joshua had no order from God to offer sacrifice. The Lord said to him—"Neither will I be with you any more, except ye destroy the accursed from among you."—Joshua vii. 12. No more was required, no more was done. Observe the Lord does not call all Israel accursed; but he says, except you destroy the accursed, &c. The fourth chapter of Leviticus is next to be considered. Verse 2—"If a soul sin through ignorance," &c. Verse 3—"If the priest that is anointed do sin, according to the sin of the people," &c. Verse 13—"And if the whole congregation of Israel do sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly," &c. Verse 14—"When the sin which they have sinned against it is known, then the congregation shall offer," &c. Verse 22—"When a ruler hath sinned and done something through ignorance," &c.

On a cursory perusal of the fourth chapter of Leviticus, it is easy to perceive that it relates solely to accidental sins, or sins committed by mistaking the laws, or the proper sacrifices and ceremonies, as ordained by Moses, for which they were bound to offer sacrifice

when they saw their mistake. It is, therefore, necessary to show that Judas was guilty through ignorance, and participated in the sins of the slain. Neither does the sacrifice of *Hezekiah* (2 Chron. xxix. 21, 22, &c.) nor that of *Ezra* (viii. 35) bear any analogy to the sacrifice offered by Judas. In fine, there is not in the whole of the law of Moses any command to offer sacrifices of expiation for Israel on account of the idolatry of individuals. Idolaters were ordered to be stoned (Deut. xvii. 5); no other conditions annexed; no sacrifices prescribed.

I think, from what I have here stated, it is plain, that if Judas offered sacrifice for the living, he did not offer that sacrifice in conformity with any precept or ordinance contained in the law of Moses, and, therefore, the inference aimed at in your "correct translation," and which you made to depend solely on the adventitious support of that law, must, consequently, fail, not having the authority of such law to support it.

I will not now say anything about the right of Judas to offer sacrifice for the dead; but I will say, that the Jewish synagogue, both before and at the time of our Saviour, did practise praying for the dead.

I need not prove it; a clergyman of the Church of England does* it for me—Johnson, "Unbloody Sacrifice," page 292. Speaking of the practice of the primitive church on this point, he says—"They seem to have learned this practice from the synagogue; for it is certain the Jews, in and before our Saviour's time, did use it"—prayers for the dead.

I think it necessary to remark, that it does not appear that Achan was guilty of idolatry. "When I saw," says he, "among the spoils a goodly Babylonish garment, and 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight, then I coveted and took them."—Joshua vii. 21. The sins were alike, you admit; therefore, the others coveted the donaries of the idols, and took them; they did not worship them. The writer does not say they did. And in Deut. vii. 25, 26—"Thou shalt not desire the silver or gold that is on them, &c., lest thou be snared therein, &c.; lest thou be a cursed thing like it." The word *lest* is here worthy of some consideration.

In the foregoing I have been actuated solely by a spirit of candour and impartiality; a question of such grave importance as that of religion should thus only be discussed.

Hoping you will excuse my lengthy epistle,

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

In consequence of the difficulty we find in making room for long articles, the length of the preceding letter obliges us to endeavour to be brief in the remarks with which we accompany it. We regret this the less, however, as the subjects of which it treats have been so fully discussed in our pages before.

In a letter from Mr. Aylmer, published in our June number, into which our respected correspondent contrived to introduce a great variety of topics, he asked us how we reconciled with the New Testament our law of divorce, which permitted to marry her that is put away. The point being very irrelevant to the subject we were discussing, we thought it enough at the time to correct his mistake in supposing that there is any such law of divorce. Mr. Power now presses us with the divorces occasionally granted by the legislature, in cases of adultery. And without admitting, as he seems to require, that the connection of the Church of England with the State makes her responsible for every act of parliament to which the Sovereign gives assent, we have no hesitation in conceding that our Church does regard such divorces as valid, and that her ministers do not scruple to remarry parties so divorced. But the prohibition against marrying her that is put away (Mat. v. 32) evidently applies only to one who is put away *contrary* to Christ's command; and our Lord makes the special exception, "saving for the cause of fornication." We believe, indeed, that there are few subjects on which it would be more easy to prove that "the Church of Rome has erred" than in her theory that "marriage is a sacrament," and the deductions which she has drawn thence (in spite of our Lord's words) as to the absolute indissolubleness, in every case, of the marriage bond—a theory the strictness of which has been more than neutralized by her practical facility in the far more objectionable measure of annulling marriages *ab initio*. More important subjects of controversy have hitherto prevented us from devoting an article to this point. We hope, however, to be able to do so at no distant time.

Next in order to matrimony, Mr. Power is so ungallant as to take purgatory. A correspondent of ours had begged to be furnished with any passage in which the Fathers of the first three centuries spoke of purgatory. "W. C. Search" replied by a quotation from the Maccabees; at which we very naturally exclaimed—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of the Maccabees?" If Mr. Power wishes to take occasion of this question to discuss the canon of Scripture, we need not be afraid to meet him, only that we think it convenient to keep distinct

separate subjects of discussion. There is no point on which the Council of Trent stands more plainly opposed to facts than in its decision which includes the Apocrypha in its canon. Our Lord and his Apostles used the same Old Testament canon as the other Jews of their time. St. Paul, who counts it one of the greatest privileges of his nation, that to them was committed the oracles of God, never accused them of unfaithfulness in this high trust. And it is demonstrable that the canon of the Jews of that time did not include the Apocrypha. Accordingly, some of the most learned of the Fathers do not include it in their canon. But when we shall have occasion to appeal to their testimony, we do not mean to quote them in the fashion used by our correspondent—"Clement Stromata, Book i., Eusebius Ecc. History," &c., which is much the same as if one was to quote Hume's History of England, without mentioning volume or page—a mode of quotation which ought never to be adopted by any one who is willing that his references should be verified.

As to the remainder of Mr. Power's letter, we shall not continue to discuss further any of the questions which turn on the most correct way of translating different passages of ancient writers. In every dispute there must be a last word; and we are content to invite any readers who are competent to judge, to turn back to our previous articles, to which Mr. Power has referred, and then judge between us. But as to the great questions at issue, something more may be said.

Much of Mr. Power's letter is expended in bringing passages in proof of purgatory, which, in point of fact, only prove that prayers for the dead were commonly practised in early times. We have already exposed this common fallacy (see p. 49). We showed that the primitive prayers for the dead did not proceed on the supposition of there being a purgatory, and that they were offered for the Blessed Virgin and the saints, who no Romanist now would assert were ever in purgatory. We pointed out (p. 59) that many were of opinion that, before the final judgment of the great day is pronounced, it is right to pray that our friends may then obtain mercy, even though we have reason to believe that God has already done what we ask, and that they are already acquitted in his sight; and we added, that prayers for the dead were also offered because the happiness of the faithful departed is believed to admit of increase, as it certainly is incomplete as long as the soul is separate from the body. But Mr. Power himself has incidentally furnished us with the strongest proof that prayers for the dead do not necessarily imply a belief in purgatory. When he was anxious to give proof that the Jews practised prayers for the dead, he offers us, instead of quotations from ancient authors, the assertion of Mr. Johnson, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice." We cannot allow that the mere assertion of a strong advocate of prayers for the dead can be allowed to take the place of proper proofs; but the mere fact that there have been men professing warm attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England, who have advocated and practised prayers for the dead, is sufficient to show that such prayers by no means involve the belief in the doctrine of purgatory.

In our last number we exposed the practice of passing off Church of England divines as supporters of Romish doctrines, by the help of garbled quotations, completely misrepresenting the opinions of the writers appealed to. And we strongly suspect that, had Mr. Power seen with his own eyes the passage in Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice which he cites, he would not have thought it fair, to say nothing about the sentences immediately before it. They run as follow:—

"The ancients did not use these prayers as if they thought of a purgatory: 'tis certain that this last is a modern invention, in comparison with the oblations and prayers offered by the primitive church in behalf of their deceased brethren. They did not allow prayers to be made for such as they thought ill men, either as to principles or practice. They prayed for the Virgin Mary, apostles, patriarchs, and such as they believed to be like them."

The quotation given by Mr. Power, which seems most directly to apply to purgatory, is from Origen. We wonder he did not say from *Saint* Origen. If our readers should ask why the name saint is not commonly given to this excellent man and laborious writer, they will be told that it is because of several heretical notions which are to be found in some of his writings. Some of these relate to this very point, of the state of the soul after death. For Origen had picked up from the Platonists opinions as to the possibility of a purification of souls after death, which led him to conclude that the torments of hell would have a purifying influence on the souls of the wicked, and would, therefore, not be eternal—a notion for which he was justly condemned by the early church. We doubt whether Mr. Power has done the Church of Rome a service by his attempt to trace the doctrine of purgatory to this source.

Lastly, with regard to the passage in Maccabees, we shall not enter further into the question of diversities of translation. Mr. Power seems not to have exactly understood the object of our reference to the case of Achan. Even if the sacrifice of Judas were offered for the dead, we have already showed that prayers for the dead by

no means imply belief in a purgatory. But we said that there is every reason to think that that sacrifice was offered not for the dead, but for the living. The case of Achan proved, that the sin of individuals might bring ruin on the whole people. But the sin of the soldiers of Judas could not be atoned for by the people (as the sin of Achan was) by their putting the idolaters to death (Deut. xvii. 5), since these soldiers were dead already. A devout Jew, then, would find, in his law, no more appropriate guide for his conduct, under the circumstances, than that contained in Leviticus iv., and would naturally offer sacrifice, to avert from the living punishment for the sins for which, he feared, they had involuntarily become responsible. This, at least, is a rational account why Judas should have offered sacrifice for the sake of the living; but we defy any one to produce, in all the law of Moses, the slightest warrant for the offering sacrifice for the benefit of the dead.

In our remarks on Mr. Power's letter, we hope we have endeavoured to aim at the same "spirit of candour and impartiality," by which he has laudably expressed his own desire to be actuated.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CATECHISMS—THE USE OF GRAVEN IMAGES.

STR.—In your last number I pointed out how readily mistakes and inconsistencies arise in the opinions of Roman Catholics, from their neglecting to consult the original documents, which should alone have with them an infallible authority. I would now call your readers' attention to a misunderstanding arising from the same cause, connected, also, with the same subject, that of the second Protestant commandment, and the cause of no little irritation between the members of the two creeds.

This misunderstanding is two-fold—Protestants taking the manuals of instruction in most ordinary use, and sanctioned by ecclesiastics of rank, as representing the doctrine of the Church; and finding the second commandment wholly omitted, or extremely mutilated, somewhat hastily conclude that Roman Catholics reject a verse apparently not very favourable to their doctrine about images. On the other hand, Roman Catholics are indignant at being supposed capable of suppressing an admitted portion of the Decalogue, and offer an explanation of its practical omission as inconsistent with the doctrine enunciated by their own Church, as is the accusation they seek to refute. I think a reference to their acknowledged standards will show that both are alike mistaken. The Roman Catholic Church neither rejects this verse, as Protestants often fancy, nor considers it to have no distinct or additional force, beyond that conveyed in the first commandment, as Roman Catholics suppose, when they account for its frequent omission by saying, that its insertion would be useless and superfluous, and a mere repetition of the First Commandment in different words.

I need hardly say, that this important verse appears in every Roman Catholic edition of the Bible, and cannot, therefore, be supposed to be rejected by them; but it is also expressly declared to be binding on all Christians by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This is so obvious, on the perusal of its exposition of the Decalogue, that it is not necessary to do more than refer to the passages.* The main point is, therefore, whether it can be omitted on the ground of its conveying no precept, or forbidding no sin, not already enjoined or forbidden in the third verse. I am not discussing at all the view that Protestants, or others exercising their own judgment on the passage, would be likely to arrive at; but I wish to elicit that interpretation which has been made for Roman Catholics, to which they are bound to submit, and in accordance with which they should deal with this fourth verse.

It is to be remembered that the Catechism of Trent, though professing to treat the two verses as forming but the one commandment, yet found it almost inevitable to expound them separately; and after commenting on the first—"Thou shalt not have strange gods before me"—precedes to explain the additional meaning of the second—"Thou shalt not make thee any sculptured image . . . thou shalt not adore them, nor honour them."† Under the latter head it shows that the entire precept points to a "two-fold manner" in which the "majesty of God can be vehemently offended;" the first consists in worshipping images in the grossest form of idolatry, by making them actual divinities—and this may fairly be included in the injunction to have no "strange gods;" but the second is the impious attempt to express in form or colours the image of the true God. This is a command not at all included in the first, nor to be deduced from it by reason—if that were allowed—as a corollary might be from a proposition. I do not say that this is the whole or the true meaning to be gathered from the fourth verse; but it is an interpretation plainly put on it by a binding Roman Catholic authority, and manifestly showing that they held it to contain a prohibition of a sin—important, for by it "the majesty of God" would be "vehemently offended"—and a sin not elsewhere denounced in the Decalogue.

* Our correspondent seems to think an assertion and a proof the same thing.—Ed. C. L.

* Original Edition, Rome, 1567, pages 398, 399, 403 and 415.

† Same, page 403.

‡ Original Italian edition. Rome, 1567.